

# REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

## CHILD WELFARE SERVICES & ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES REALIGNMENT REPORT: OUTCOME & EXPENDITURE DATA SUMMARY

May 2017 Annual Report



STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
Edmond G. Brown Jr., Governor

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY  
Diana S. Dooley, Secretary

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
Will Lightbourne, Director

CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES DIVISION  
Gregory Rose, Deputy Director

# CHILD WELFARE SERVICES & ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES REALIGNMENT REPORT

## OUTCOME AND EXPENDITURE DATA SUMMARY

May 2017 Annual Report to the Legislature

### 2011 Realignment of the Child Welfare Services and Adult Protective Services Systems

Senate Bill (SB) 1013 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 35, Statutes of 2012) added Welfare and Institutions Code Section (W&IC) 10104 to require the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to annually report to the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature, and publicly post on the CDSS internet website, a summary of outcome and expenditure data that allows for monitoring of changes over time that may have occurred as a result of the 2011 Realignment of the child welfare services and adult protective services systems.

# CONTENTS

## CHILD WELFARE

<b>SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1: SAFETY CONSTELLATION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
1.1 Referral, Substantiation, and Entry Rates.....	10
1.2 Referrals Evaluated Out .....	11
1.3 Maltreatment in Foster Care (S1).....	12
1.4 Recurrence of Maltreatment (S2) .....	12
1.5 Timely Response to Child Abuse Investigations .....	13
1.6 Caseworker Visits with Children .....	143
<b>2: PLACEMENT AND CASELOAD CONSTELLATION .....</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 Initial Placements over Time .....	16
2.2 Point in Time by Placement Type .....	17
2.3 Children and Youth in Group Homes for Longer than One Year.....	18
2.4 Placement Stability (P5) .....	19
2.5 Median Length of Stay .....	20
<b>3: PERMANENCY CONSTELLATION.....</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1 Realignment of Adoptions Services.....	21
3.2 Permanency within 12 Months for Kids Entering Care (P1).....	22
3.3 Permanency within 12 Months for Kids in Care 12-23 Months (P2).....	22
3.4 Permanency within 12 Months for Kids in Care 24 Months or Longer (P3).....	23
3.5 Reentry within 12 Months (P4).....	24
3.6 Status at Exit for Youth Aging Out of Foster Care.....	25
<b>COUNTY GROWTH &amp; STAFFING .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>REALIGNMENT EXPENDITURES SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b><u>ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES</u>.....</b>	<b>38</b>

## CHILD WELFARE

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This report is the fifth annual report on the impact of 2011 realignment of California's child welfare system. Child welfare outcomes in California have been relatively stable over the past six years. Further, there do not appear to be any negative consequences of having transferred fiscal responsibility for the program to the county level.

#### *Safety Constellation*

Referral rates for children with at least one allegation of maltreatment have remained relatively constant since 2009. There has been a slight increase from 50.6 per 1,000 children in 2009 to 55.1 per 1,000 children in 2015, though there was a very slight decrease in referral rates between 2012 and 2013. Substantiation rates (referrals that are confirmed through an investigation) for 2009 to 2015 have decreased from 9.9 per 1,000 children to 8.5 per 1,000 children, while rates of entry have remained almost unchanged, varying between 3.3 and 3.5 for the same time period. Child welfare practices of investigating referrals within policy timeframes continue to remain above state standards and children continue to be protected from further maltreatment (as measured by Recurrence of Maltreatment, Figure 4, which has decreased slightly), based on the current data.

Lastly, for safety, statewide performance on monthly caseworker visits with children continues to improve, with a seven percent increase in compliance with the monthly requirement between Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 and FY 2015-16.

#### *Placement and Caseload Constellation*

There has been a significant decline in the foster care caseload over the last 16 years. Caseload has declined more than 47 percent from 108,159 in 2000 to 56,254<sup>1</sup> in 2016. Foster care caseloads were lowest in July 2012 at 55,558.

Between FY 2009-10 and FY 2015-16, the number of children for whom the first placement is with a relative/kin increased from 18 percent to 27 percent, while the number of children placed in group homes decreased from 16 percent to 12 percent. Relative homes continue to be the predominant placement for children in care and the proportion of children experiencing placement stability has improved, going from 4.14 moves per 1,000 days in FY 2010-11 to 3.7 moves per 1,000 days for FY 2015-16, achieving the national standard of 4.12 moves or fewer.

Finally, from 2008 through 2013, the median length of stay for entries into foster care has increased by 62 days from 396 days to 459 days. This increase was most pronounced between 2011 and 2012, when the median length of stay was extended by 29 days.

<sup>1</sup> This figure includes all agencies and children ages 0-17.

### *Permanency Constellation*

The proportion of children who entered foster care and subsequently exited to permanency<sup>2</sup> due to guardianship, adoption or reunification within 12 months dropped from 40.6 percent in FY 2009-10 to 34.8 percent in FY 2014-15. From FY 2010-11 to FY 2015-16, the proportion of children who exited to permanency after being in care for 12 to 23 months was relatively stable (ranging from 44.5 percent to 46.1 percent). The proportion of children in care for 24 months or longer and subsequently exited to permanency increased from 23.5 percent to 28.7 percent between FY 2010-11 and FY 2015-16. Of all children who exited foster care to permanency in FY 2013-14, 11.8 percent reentered foster care within 12 months, which is an improvement over the 12.5 percent who reentered within 12 months in FY 2011-12. While there may be some overlap, the two measures (permanency within 12 months and re-entry) are not restricted to the same group of children.

## INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) is the single state agency responsible for the administration and supervision of the Child Welfare Services (CWS) system, a system authorized through the federal Social Security Act, Subparts IV-E and IV-B and through various chapters of the California Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC). Oversight and monitoring of the CWS system, including development of programmatic and fiscal policy and training and technical assistance, are central to this responsibility. The fiscal and programmatic administration of CWS programs continues to be data-informed to ensure compliance with state plan requirements and to guarantee maximization of federal financial participation for these programs.

The Budget Act of 2011 included a major realignment of public safety programs from the state to local governments. Known as 2011 Realignment, this shift moves programs and fiscal responsibility to the level of government that can best provide the services, while eliminating duplication of effort, generating savings, and increasing flexibility. Assembly Bill (AB) 118 (Chapter 40, Statutes of 2011) and ABX1 16 (Chapter 13, Statutes of 2011), realigned the CDSS funding for Child Welfare Services, Adoption Services, Foster Care, Adult Protective Services, and programs from the state to local governments and redirects specified tax revenues to fund this effort. In addition, Senate Bill (SB) 1013 (Chapter 35, Statutes of 2012) provided necessary statutory and technical changes to implement provisions of the Budget Act of 2012 related to 2011 Realignment. This major shift in funding has resulted in an increased interest in monitoring child welfare services and adult protective services to determine whether or not the implementation of realignment has resulted in changes to outcomes for the populations served by these programs.

<sup>2</sup> While the definition of “permanency” is complex and should consider social, emotional and legal aspects, for the purposes of this document, it means exiting foster care to a permanent family through reunification, guardianship or adoption.

CDSS increased its use of data to oversee county CWS as a result of the passage of AB 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2001). SB 1013 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 35, Statutes of 2012) added W&IC Section 10104 to require CDSS to annually report to the appropriate fiscal and policy committees of the Legislature, and publicly post on the Department's internet website, a summary of outcome and expenditure data that allows for monitoring of changes over time that may have occurred as a result of the 2011 realignment. Programmatic data have provided greater accountability for child and family outcomes across California, and serve as the foundation for this annual report to the Legislature required by SB 1013. In addition, SB 855 (Committee of Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 29, Statutes of 2014) further amended W&IC Section 10104 to include the amount of realignment growth funds each county receives, the CWS social worker caseload per county and the number of authorized positions. With the passage of AB 2015 (Chapter 182, Statutes of 2016), W&IC Section 10104 was amended to include the reported expenditures for counties that are participating in the federal Title IV-E waiver and how close counties are to funding the optimum caseload ratios recommended by the evaluation conducted pursuant to Section 10609.5, also known as the California SB 2030 Study. Performance measures and process data contained in this report are statewide and reflect a cross section of child welfare practices that impact child and family safety, permanency, and well-being, many of which were developed pursuant to AB 636. Through continuous quality improvement, the state and counties systematically review the data and assess the changes that occur in demographics, programs, and practices that account for positive or negative trends. Data<sup>3</sup> contained in this report were drawn from the Child Welfare System/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) and are available in the publicly accessible CDSS/UC Berkeley Dynamic Report system: [http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/)<sup>4</sup>.

County-specific data can be found at: <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/Realignment>. It should be noted that the figures in the Safety Constellation section, with the exception of Figures 3 and 7, contain child welfare data only and do not apply to probation.

In addition, certain data measures (in Figures 3, 4, 9b, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15) in this year's report reflect revised methodologies. Due to the changes in methodologies effective in 2015, the data contained in reports prior to April 2016 cannot be compared with the data in this year's report. An explanation of the change in the methodology and analysis of each measure is provided below. Though reports prior to the April 2016 report and this report cannot be directly compared, the performance over time of each revised data measure can be compared within this report because the new methodology has been applied to historical data presented in this report.

<sup>3</sup> Changes in the data over time are calculated as percent change rather than absolute differences in order to account for the varying "sizes" of the units of data.

<sup>4</sup> Figures 1-9a and 10-16 in this report were prepared by the staff of the California Child Welfare Indicators Project, CSSR, UC Berkeley using the CWS/CMS 2015 Q3 extract and can be found at [http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare)



## Organization of the Report

The CWS portion of this report is organized into three sections: 1) Performance Measures, 2) County Growth & Staffing and 3) Expenditures Summary. Within the Performance Measures section are three separate constellations: 1) Safety Outcomes, 2) Placement and Caseload Outcomes and 3) Permanency Outcomes. Constellations of outcomes, rather than single measures, are appropriate for the complex CWS system: changes in one part of the system can significantly affect other areas.

Examining longitudinal outcome data requires caution and attention to a number of key analytic considerations, as follows:

- Child welfare is a system and data related to this system are interconnected; measures should not be viewed in isolation.
- Comparing data between various counties on any given measure has limitations due to economic, geographic and demographic differences that may require different prevention and intervention strategies from one county to the other.
- In small counties, a small number of children, even one family, can create significant shifts in data.
- Performance in any given year needs to be viewed in the context of prior performance.
- Individual county data may differ from statewide data due to local demographics, economics, size and other factors.

Information about county Realignment growth funds is included in this report for the third time. The 2011 Realignment growth is distributed by the State Controller's Office (SCO) to the county welfare departments in the fall every year for the prior year's growth the counties earned. For example, the county growth funds earned in FY 2014-15 by the counties are distributed by SCO on December 24, 2015. Due to county budgeting processes, these funds are often not expended until the next FY, and sometimes not fully spent until the following FY after that. Also included in this report is information related to county CWS staffing and caseloads.

CDSS continues to monitor county claiming of federal funds. Counties are required to claim actual costs for the realigned CWS programs in the same manner as they did prior to implementation of 2011 Realignment. Expenditures for all realigned programs displayed in the [Realignment Expenditures Summary](#) (Attachment A) compare four years of actuals beginning with FY 2011-12 (when Realignment went into effect). The percent change from year to year has been identified as follows:

- Less than zero (0) percent change highlighted in blue
- Between zero (0) percent and fifty (50) percent change highlighted in red
- Between fifty (50) percent and one hundred (100) percent change highlighted in green
- Above one hundred (100) percent change highlighted in purple

The expenditures for FYs 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15 and 2015-16, as displayed in the Realignment Expenditures Summary, capture the non-federal share comprised wholly of Local Revenue Fund (LRF) and county funds. Because counties have up to nine months to submit revisions to their expenditures, FY 2014-15 expenditure data have now been finalized and may differ from last year's report. FY 2015-16 expenditure data are preliminary and subject to change once counties submit their revised claims.

This report also contains an entire section dedicated to the Adult Protective Services (APS) program with demographic data and expenditure data related to Realignment.



## PERFORMANCE MEASURES

On October 10, 2014, the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) issued a Federal Register notice<sup>5</sup> informing states of the final plan to replace the outcome measures used to determine a state's substantial conformity with Titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act. On September 28, 2015, CDSS released All County Letter (ACL) 15-63 outlining these changes and providing instructions for counties. On October 11, 2016, the ACF issued Technical Bulletin #9 which establishes a new plan for use of statewide data indicators and national standards as contextual data for the third round of the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSRs). While ACF is revising the national standards, California continues to utilize the current national standards per W&IC Section 10601.2 and will continue to do so until ACF establishes and releases information regarding the new national standards. These federal outcome measures continue to be used by county child welfare and juvenile probation agencies for context within the C-CFSR process to measure performance in ensuring the safety, permanency and well-being of children involved in their respective systems. The 17 federal outcome measures that were used in prior years have been replaced, updated or eliminated to produce a total of seven new federal outcome measures. The current measures more closely track what is important to know about California's child welfare practice and the impact on outcomes for children and families. The current federal measures are listed below, with a description of the measure:

### Safety

- S1: Maltreatment in foster care: *Of all children in foster care during a 12-month period, what is the rate of victimization per day of foster care?*
- S2: Recurrence of maltreatment: *Of all children who were victims of a substantiated or indicated maltreatment report during a 12-month reporting period, what percent were victims of another substantiated or indicated maltreatment report within 12 months of their initial report?*

### Permanency

- P1: Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care: *Of all children who enter foster care in a 12-month period, what percent are discharged to permanency within 12 months of entering foster care?*
- P2: Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 12 to 23 months: *Of all children in foster care on the first day of a 12-month period, who had been in foster care (in that episode) between 12 and 23 months, what percent discharged from foster care to permanency within 12 months of the first day of the period?*
- P3: Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care 24 months or longer: *Of all children in foster care on the first day of a 12 month period who had been in foster care (in that episode) for 24 months or more, what percent discharged to permanency within 12 months of the first day of the 12 month period?*

<sup>5</sup> Register 79 FR 61241; ACF published a correction to this Final Rule in the Federal Register 80 FR 27263 on May 13, 2015. <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/resource/cfsr-technical-bulletin-9>

- P4: Re-entry into foster care in 12 months: *Of all children who enter foster care in a 12-month period who discharged within 12 months to reunification, live with relative, or guardianship, what percent re-entered foster care within 12 months of their discharge?*
- P5: Placement Stability: *Of all children who enter foster care in a 12-month period, what is the rate of placement moves per day of foster care?*

## 1: Safety Constellation

California's CWS has the paramount goal of keeping children safe from abuse and neglect. County child welfare agencies must ensure that children who have been found to be victims of maltreatment are protected from further abuse whether they remain at home or are placed in an out-of-home setting. For children at risk of being removed from their homes, the county child welfare agency must appropriately consider providing services to families in crisis to prevent or remedy abuse or neglect. Whenever possible, the goal is preserving families and keeping children safely in their own homes.

### 1.1 - Referral, Substantiation and Entry Rates

**Referral rates** tell us how many children with at least one allegation of maltreatment are reported to a county. The numbers are presented as *per 1,000 children* in the general child population.

**Substantiation rates** tell us how many children with an allegation of maltreatment have had that allegation confirmed through an investigation. The numbers are presented as *per 1,000 children* in the general child population. Generally, substantiation rates can highlight systemic and practice issues, assist in evaluating the effectiveness of existing strategies and/or inform planning for prevention, intervention and treatment of abuse and neglect.

**Entry rates** tell us how many children entered foster care as a result of a substantiated allegation. The numbers are presented as *per 1,000 children* in the general child population.

Figure 1 illustrates that referral rates<sup>6</sup> have slightly increased from 51.6 per 1,000 children in 2010 to 55.1 per 1,000 children in 2015 with a very slight decrease between 2012 and 2013. Substantiation rates for 2010 to 2015 have decreased from 9.6 per 1,000 children to 8.5 per 1,000 children while rates of entry have remained almost unchanged, ranging from 3.3 to 3.5 per 1,000 children for the same time period. Although referral rates are slightly increasing, there continues to be a decrease in the rate of substantiations. This may be attributed to a combination of factors such as evolving child welfare practices related to engagement of children and their families during investigations through Safety Organized Practice, providing in-home supportive services and strategies that provide alternative services, such as Differential Response.

<sup>6</sup> Referral rates are determined by the unduplicated count of children in the state with at least one allegation of maltreatment during the specified period.

**Figure 1: Rate of children with allegations, substantiations, and entries (per 1,000)**

Date		Jan-Dec 2010	Jan-Dec 2011	Jan-Dec 2012	Jan-Dec 2013	Jan-Dec 2014	Jan-Dec 2015
Children with allegations	per 1,000	51.6	51.6	53.1	52.9	54.6	55.1
	n	478,679	474,670	486,268	481,895	497,011	501,430
Children with substantiated allegations	per 1,000	9.6	9.5	9.3	9.2	9.1	8.5
	n	88,716	87,452	84,877	83,990	82,393	77,549
Children with entries	per 1,000	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4
	n	30,688	30,086	80,816	32,023	32,053	30,660
Child population (0-17 years)	N	9,273,754	9,203,420	9,149,419	9,104,860	9,097,971	9,102,486

Agency: Child Welfare, Age: 0-17 Years, Children with Allegations, Substantiations, and Entries per 1,000 Child Population

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/RefRates.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/RefRates.aspx)

## 1.2 - Referrals Evaluated Out

Not all referrals received are investigated by county child welfare agencies. On average, more referrals are “evaluated out” than are substantiated (see Figure 2). In comparing FY 2010-11 to FY 2015-16, there has been an increase in the number of referrals that were evaluated out, from 19 percent to 23 percent. Referrals that are evaluated out are not assigned to a county Emergency Response (ER) social worker for investigation. Some examples of situations when a referral is evaluated out include:

- Insufficient information is provided in the initial report (e.g., an anonymous person calls the ER hotline to report that “A mom is beating her child in a local shopping center” and then hangs up).
- The alleged perpetrator is not a parent or caretaker, in which case the allegation is more appropriately referred to local law enforcement.
- The reported incident does not meet the statutory threshold for child abuse or neglect (e.g., two adolescent siblings in a physical altercation).

Criteria or thresholds influencing ER investigations may vary due to informal and formal changes in local policy or practice, differences in state or federal regulations or instructions (or their interpretations), training needs and other factors. Routine studies of referral data over time may signal the need for further analysis if the proportion of referrals that are evaluated out in a certain jurisdiction varies significantly over time. Also, local analysis of the referrals that are evaluated out can help identify emerging or recurring issues for families in the community that do not meet the threshold for intervention. This can inform a county’s prevention/early intervention and Differential Response efforts in assisting families to resolve crises before they escalate to a level that requires CWS intervention. The state and counties continue to enhance the continuous quality improvement (CQI) system across the state to use data to identify problems, evaluate effective practices and identify opportunities to make improvements in the system.

**Figure 2: Children and youth with allegations, by disposition type**

		Jul 2010- Jun 2011	Jul 2011- Jun 2012	Jul 2012- Jun 2013	Jul 2013- Jun 2014	Jul 2014- Jun 2015	Jul 2015- Jun 2016
<b>Substantiated</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>15%</b>
	<b>n</b>	89,691	85,039	83,948	83,569	79,913	75,321
<b>Inconclusive</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>24%</b>
	<b>n</b>	68,595	77,099	91,352	102,219	113,244	118,500
<b>Unfounded</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>37%</b>
	<b>n</b>	228,882	222,852	205,156	196,781	193,852	184,581
<b>Assessment only/ evaluated out</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>23%</b>
	<b>n</b>	87,730	94,541	99,304	105,389	110,062	112,570
<b>Not yet determined</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2%</b>
	<b>n</b>	475	489	556	715	1,490	8,716
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>475,373</b>	<b>480,020</b>	<b>480,316</b>	<b>488,673</b>	<b>498,561</b>	<b>499,688</b>

Agency: Child Welfare, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/Allegations.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/Allegations.aspx)**1.3 - Maltreatment in foster care**

**Maltreatment in foster care (S1)** is a federal measure that determines the rate of victimization per 100,000 days of foster care for all children in foster care during a 12 month period. This measure contains data on the rate of victimization per day, per child in foster care and includes multiple incidents of substantiated maltreatment as well as maltreatment by any perpetrator while the child is in foster care.

California continues to make progress in this area, as the rate of substantiated maltreatment has declined since FY 2010-2011. In FY 2015-16, this rate was 8.3 instances of maltreatment per 100,000 days of foster care, which falls below of the national standard of 8.5 or fewer.

**Figure 3: Maltreatment in foster care**

		Jul 2010-Jun 2011	Jul 2011-Jun 2012	Jul 2012-Jun 2013	Jul 2013-Jun 2014	Jul 2014-Jun 2015	Jul 2015- Jun 2016
<b>Instances of substantiated maltreatment</b>	<b>per 100,000 days</b>	<b>9.92</b>	<b>9.60</b>	<b>9.80</b>	<b>8.76</b>	<b>8.79</b>	<b>8.30</b>
	<b>n</b>	1,936	1,806	1,820	1,680	1,706	1,598
<b>Foster care days</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>19,525,576</b>	<b>18,806,231</b>	<b>18,562,091</b>	<b>19,170,213</b>	<b>19,397,976</b>	<b>19,262,065</b>

Agency: All, Number of Days in Care: 8 days or more, Age: 0-17 Years, Rate per 100,000 days

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/S1.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/S1.aspx)

#### 1.4 - Recurrence of Maltreatment

**Recurrence of maltreatment (S2)** is a federal measure that determines the proportion of children who had at least one additional substantiated maltreatment report within 12 months following the date of the initial substantiated report. This measure evaluates the county child welfare agency's success in preventing subsequent maltreatment of a child for whom they had a substantiated report of maltreatment within the prior 12 months.

Recurrence of maltreatment remains stable, ranging from 9.7 percent to 10.5 percent over the last six years, with a decrease from 10.5 percent in FY 2012-13 to 9.7 percent in FY 2014-15. The national standard for this measure is 9.1 percent or less. This measure provides the state, counties and stakeholders with information about the most important outcome for children: freedom from abuse or neglect. It is cursory information, however, as the measure is limited in its ability to establish a direct causal link between one or more prevention or intervention strategies and a particular county's relative success on this measure.

**Figure 4: Recurrence of maltreatment in foster care**

Date		Jul 2009- Jun 2010	Jul 2010- Jun 2011	Jul 2011- Jun 2012	Jul 2012- Jun 2013	Jul 2013- Jun 2014	Jul 2014- Jun 2015
Recurrence of maltreatment within 12 months	%	10.5%	10.1%	10.1%	10.5%	10.2%	9.7%
	n	8,357	8,355	7,929	8,214	7,984	7,280
Children with substantiated allegations during 12-month period	N	79,847	82,429	78,696	78,031	78,284	75,040

Agency: Child Welfare, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://csr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/S2.aspx](http://csr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/S2.aspx)

#### 1.5 - Timely Response to Child Abuse Investigations

**Timely response to child abuse investigation data** are used to assess performance for state and federal requirements for timely investigations of child abuse and neglect allegations. Both the immediate and 10-day response measures inform whether investigations were initiated and contact was made with the alleged child victim within the required timeframe. They also help identify possible causes for success, barriers to improvement, potential solutions and strategies for change. Finally, these measures may offer insight into the effects of changes in policies and practice, particularly at the county level.

As shown in Figures 5 and 6, performance is above the state goal of 90 percent, with immediate response referrals receiving a timely response consistently over 97 percent of the time between 2011 and 2016. Ten-day response referrals receiving a timely response have been hovering between 93 and 95 percent during the 2011 to 2016. The April to June intervals for each year are presented below.

**Figure 5: Immediate response referrals receiving a timely response**

		Apr-Jun 2011	Apr-Jun 2012	Apr-Jun 2013	Apr-Jun 2014	Apr-Jun 2015	Apr-Jun 2016
<b>Immediate response referrals receiving a timely response</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>98.1%</b>	<b>98.4%</b>	<b>98.0%</b>	<b>98.1%</b>	<b>98.1%</b>	<b>97.3%</b>
	<b>N</b>	17,570	18,339	19,615	18,342	17,411	16,608
<b>Required immediate response referrals</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>19,919</b>	<b>18,643</b>	<b>20,014</b>	<b>18,696</b>	<b>17,745</b>	<b>17,074</b>

Agency: Child Welfare, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/CDSS\\_2B.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/CDSS_2B.aspx)

**Figure 6: Ten-day response referrals receiving a timely response**

		Apr-Jun 2011	Apr-Jun 2012	Apr-Jun 2013	Apr-Jun 2014	Apr-Jun 2015	Apr-Jun 2016
<b>Ten-day response referrals receiving a timely response</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>94.5%</b>	<b>94.3%</b>	<b>94.2%</b>	<b>95.1%</b>	<b>94.7%</b>	<b>93.4%</b>
	<b>N</b>	41,853	40,210	40,275	41,730	41,639	42,498
<b>Required ten-day response referrals</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>44,284</b>	<b>42,637</b>	<b>42,767</b>	<b>43,898</b>	<b>43,978</b>	<b>45,501</b>

Agency: Child Welfare, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/CDSS\\_2B.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/CDSS_2B.aspx)

### 1.6 - Caseworker Visits with Children

This measure is a two-part federal performance measure that focuses on both timeliness and location of the caseworker's visits for children placed in foster care (out of their home)<sup>7</sup>. In addition to being a federal requirement, research<sup>8</sup> demonstrates that there is a strong correlation between frequent caseworker visits with foster children and positive outcomes for these children, such as timely achievement of permanency.

**Timeliness** measures the percentage of monthly face-to-face caseworker visits made with children in foster care placements. California continues to improve the proportion of children who are visited each month, increasing from 90.5 percent to 94.6 percent between FY 2010-11 and FY 2015-16<sup>9</sup>. Although California continues to make steady progress in ensuring children are visited on a monthly basis, state performance is still slightly below the federal guideline of 95 percent for FY 2015-16.

<sup>7</sup> This measure is based on the total number of visits that would occur during the fiscal year if each foster child were visited once every full calendar month that they are in care. In addition, due to the importance of monthly visitation with children who have open cases and remain in their home, a state measure addressing this topic is now publically available on the CDSS/UC Berkeley Dynamic Report system.

**Location** measures the percentage of visits that occurred in the child's residence. Federal law requires that, of monthly visits that occur, at least 50 percent of those visits must occur in the residence of the child (California's target is set at 51 percent). California has continued to improve its performance on this measure, with the proportion of visits occurring in the child's home increasing from 73.6 percent to 79.5 percent between FY 2010-11 and FY 2015-16.

It should be noted that the monthly caseworker visit requirement also pertains to children and youth in foster care who are supervised by county probation agencies. As shown in Figure 7 below, probation data in CWS/CMS became available starting in FY 2012-13. Until FY 2012-13, probation agencies did not have the ability to input information into CWS/CMS and so probation performance for this measure could not be captured. While access to CWS/CMS and the ability of probation agencies to enter placement data on federally eligible foster care wards has provided some statewide data on probation youth, workload and data integrity complications have arisen as well. The most onerous, from the perspective of probation agencies, is the burden of entering placement data into both the county-specific systems probation agencies use for meeting their global case management needs as well as into CWS/CMS.

**Figure 7: Caseworker Visits with Children**

Data display		Agency: Child Welfare		Agency: Child Welfare and Probation			
		Jul 2010-Jun 2011	Jul 2011-Jun 2012	Jul 2012-Jun 2013	Jul 2013-Jun 2014	Jul 2014-Jun 2015	Jul 2015-Jun 2016
Visit months (visited during month)	%	<b>90.5%</b>	<b>93.3%</b>	<b>92.1%</b>	<b>93.6%</b>	<b>94.2%</b>	<b>94.6%</b>
	n	506,926	503,134	524,229	551,213	562,839	561,795
Months open (in care entire month)	N	560,192	539,003	569,152	589,136	597,456	594,108
Visited in the residence	%	<b>73.6%</b>	<b>75.7%</b>	<b>77.2%</b>	<b>78.9%</b>	<b>79.7%</b>	<b>79.5%</b>
	n	373,173	380,813	404,510	434,921	448,485	446,709
Visit months (visited during month)	N	506,926	503,134	524,229	551,213	562,839	561,795

Agency: Jul 2010 through Jun 2012--Child Welfare, Jul 2012 through Jun 2016--Child Welfare and Probation; Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/CDSS\\_2F.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/CDSS_2F.aspx)

## 2: Placement and Caseload Constellation

For children who cannot remain safely in their homes, a constellation of placement and caseload indicators provide information on the number of children who are in out-of-home care at any given point in time, their initial and subsequent placements and their stability in those placements. This information is crucial for counties in managing their resources towards



achieving the driving goal for children in foster care -- attaining timely permanency. The placement types included below account for over 95 percent of placements<sup>10</sup>:

- Relatives/Kin
- Guardians
- Foster Family Homes
- Foster Family Agency Certified Homes
- Group Homes

### 2.1 - Initial Placements over Time

This measure provides information about children's initial placements when they enter foster care for the first time and how that has changed over time. It does not include children who have re-entered foster care after exiting the system.

Because removal from their parents can be a traumatic event for children, the initial placement is important to consider. Federal law and best practices suggest the importance of placing children in the least restrictive, most family-like setting. Ideally, this means placement with relatives or close family friends with whom children are already connected.

Figure 8 displays the initial placements for children entering foster care for the first time, by placement type. Since FY 2010-11, the percentage of children for whom the first placement was with kin increased from 20 percent to 27 percent in FY 2015-16, while the proportion of children placed in group homes decreased from 15 percent to 12 percent over the same time period. Over the past five years, Foster Family Agencies (FFAs) have consistently accounted for 40 to 41 percent of initial placements.

---

<sup>10</sup> Other placement types include: Shelters, court-specified, small family homes, medical facilities, tribe-specified homes, and Supervised Independent Living Placements.

**Figure 8: First entries to out-of-home care, by placement type**

Date		Jul 2010-Jun 2011	Jul 2011-Jun 2012	Jul 2012-Jun 2013	Jul 2013-Jun 2014	Jul 2014-Jun 2015	Jul 2015-Jun 2016
Pre-adopt	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	n	12	22	21	7	4	.
Kin	%	20%	23%	24%	25%	26%	27%
	n	5,008	5,404	6,067	6,631	6,402	6,048
Foster	%	18%	17%	17%	17%	16%	17%
	n	4,393	4,067	4,232	4,332	3,947	4,131
FFA	%	41%	40%	41%	40%	41%	40%
	n	10,208	9,510	10,370	10,342	10,211	9,721
Court specified	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	n	60	51	34	46	45	36
Group	%	15%	14%	13%	13%	13%	12%
	n	3,601	3,336	3,281	3,378	3,232	3,060
Shelter	%	4%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%
	n	890	1,028	826	864	813	736
Guardian	%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	1%
	n	519	444	418	436	408	356
SILP	%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	n	5	6	10	3	4	6
Total	N	24,696	23,868	25,259	26,039	25,066	24,454

Agency: All, Episode Count: First Entry, Number of Days in Care: 8 days or more, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/Entries.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/Entries.aspx)

## 2.2 - Point in Time by Placement Type

This measure provides information about the foster care caseload over time and children's placement types on July 1st of each year. As depicted in Figure 9a, more children in foster care are placed with a relative/kin than in any other setting. Also included in the relative/kin category are children who are placed with someone with whom they have a close relationship, referred to as a "Non-Relative Extended Family Member".

**Figure 9a: In care on July 1, by placement type**

		Jul 1, 2011	Jul 1, 2012	Jul 1, 2013	Jul 1, 2014	Jul 1, 2015	Jul 1, 2016
<b>Pre-adopt</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>
	<b>n</b>	1,494	1,438	1,497	1,527	1,569	1,805
<b>Kin</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>37%</b>
	<b>n</b>	18,383	18,855	20,004	21,012	21,096	20,555
<b>Foster</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>11%</b>
	<b>n</b>	5,222	5,060	5,151	5,416	5,414	6,048
<b>FFA</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>25%</b>
	<b>n</b>	15,460	14,016	14,254	14,764	14,962	14,295
<b>Court specified</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	<b>n</b>	197	196	193	172	206	161
<b>Group</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>
	<b>n</b>	5,851	5,594	5,472	5,305	5,169	4,851
<b>Shelter</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	<b>n</b>	119	142	122	125	115	113
<b>Non-foster care</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>
	<b>n</b>	533	681	611	625	566	495
<b>Transitional housing</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	<b>n</b>	97	92	81	61	88	89
<b>Guardian - dependent</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>
	<b>n</b>	2,046	1,753	1,530	1,345	1,187	1,093
<b>Guardian - other</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>
	<b>n</b>	4,912	4,873	4,879	4,817	4,646	4,472
<b>Runaway</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>
	<b>n</b>	1,256	1,097	1,036	988	955	986
<b>Trial home visit</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>
	<b>n</b>	548	438	433	507	363	451
<b>SILP</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>
	<b>n</b>	2	1	3	4	0	0
<b>Other</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>
	<b>n</b>	1,464	1,346	1,288	1,142	992	840
<b>Total</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>57,584</b>	<b>55,582</b>	<b>56,556</b>	<b>57,810</b>	<b>57,328</b>	<b>56,254</b>

Agency: All, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/PIT.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/PIT.aspx)**2.3 - Children and Youth in Group Homes for Longer than One Year**

The 2011 Realignment Trailer Bill added W&IC Section 11467(c)(2) requiring CDSS to work with stakeholders to develop a procedure for identifying youth who have been in group care for one year or longer to determine the reason for the continued stay and to develop a plan for each child to transition to a family-like setting as appropriate. In addition, AB 74 (Committee on

Budget, Chapter 21, Statutes of 2013) added W&IC Section 16010.8 requiring CDSS to report to the Legislature on the outcomes of the assessment of each youth in group care for longer than one year and the outcomes of planned or actual transitions to family settings. Last year, CDSS and UC Berkeley revised this measure's methodology to more accurately capture the total number of youth in group care for longer than one year. Figure 9b shows the total number of children and youth in a group home for longer than one year, reflecting a decline of almost 2 percentage points in the total number of children in group home care long than one year, from 31.8 percent in 2011 to 29.7 percent in 2016.

**Figure 9b: In care July 1, 2016, number of children/youth in a group home for longer than one year**

		Jul-Jun 2011	Jul-Jun 2012	Jul-Jun 2013	Jul-Jun 2014	Jul-Jun 2015	Jul-Jun 2016
<b>Children in Group Homes with Placements Longer than 1 Year</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>31.8%</b>	<b>31.3%</b>	<b>31.5%</b>	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>29.0%</b>	<b>29.7%</b>
	<b>n</b>	2,033	1,950	1,923	1,809	1,661	1,603
<b>Total Children in Group Home Placements</b>	<b>N</b>	6,393	6,236	6,114	5,930	5,736	5,401

Agency: Child Welfare and Probation; Age: 0-18 Years;

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/CDSS\\_4C.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/CDSS_4C.aspx)

## 2.4 - Placement Stability (P5)

The placement stability measure describes the number of placement moves per 1,000 days for children who have been in foster care for at least eight days. This measure uses an entry cohort and allows for a control that filters for time in foster care and measuring moves per placement day versus the total number of moves per child. This means there is an accurate account of the actual number of moves. This measure does not count the initial removal as a placement move.

Since placement changes can be disruptive to children, it is important to note the number of these placement changes. Stability increases a child's ability to develop healthy, secure relationships and maintain educational achievement. It also increases the opportunity for a child to develop positive, caring relationships with their foster caregivers. Such relationships sometimes result in a child becoming a permanent member of the family when returning home is not possible. Additionally, individual placement changes can be made for positive reasons such as a child moving from a group home to a relative's home or to a placement with siblings. As shown in Figure 10, placement stability has improved, decreasing from 4.14 moves per 1,000 days in FY 2010-11 to 3.74 moves per 1,000 days in FY 2015-16, achieving the national goal of 4.12 or fewer. The increase in relative/kin placements may be a contributing factor to the improvement in placement stability.

**Figure 10: Placement stability**

		Jul 2010-Jun 2011	Jul 2011-Jun 2012	Jul 2012-Jun 2013	Jul 2013-Jun 2014	Jul 2014-Jun 2015	Jul 2015-Jun 2016
<b>Number of placement moves</b>	<b>per 1,000 days</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>3.74</b>
	n	19,754	18,515	18,272	19,179	18,689	17,776
<b>Foster care days (children with entries)</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>4,774,502</b>	<b>4,555,959</b>	<b>4,781,397</b>	<b>5,025,863</b>	<b>4,930,847</b>	<b>4,757,359</b>

Agency: All, Number of Days in Care: 8 days or more, Rate per 1,000 days

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/P5.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/P5.aspx)

## 2.5 - Median Length of Stay

This measure describes the median amount of time children spend in foster care. Length of stay is counted in days and the median number of days reflects how much time it takes half (50 percent) of the children who entered foster care during a calendar year to exit from care. This measure is a useful way to summarize, with a single number, what might be considered a “characteristic” length of stay in foster care. The median differs from the average in that it reduces the effect of outliers such as those children who are in care for very long or very brief periods.

Since foster care is intended to be a temporary intervention for children until they can return home safely or leave foster care for a permanent family, this measure tracks whether or not children who enter foster care exit from care in a timely manner. Median length of stay for children entering care is presented in Figure 11. Among children entering care between 2008 and 2009, the median length of stay remained relatively stable at just below 400 days. However, after 2009 the length of stay began to get longer, with a 23-day increase in 2010, and a larger 29-day increase in 2012. CDSS is currently conducting an in-depth analysis of this data to determine why the length of stay is increasing. The Department’s findings will be included in next year’s report.

**Figure 11: Median length of stay, in days**

		Jan-Dec 2008	Jan-Dec 2009	Jan-Dec 2010	Jan-Dec 2011	Jan-Dec 2012	Jan-Dec 2013
<b>Median length of stay</b>	<b>Days</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>421</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>459</b>
<b>Sample size</b>	<b>N</b>	22,557	21,724	21,480	21,226	22,015	23,643

Agency: Child Welfare; Episode Count: First Entry; Number of Days in Care: 8 days or more; Age: 0-17 Years; Days to exit or 18th birthday, whichever first

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/stay.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/stay.aspx)

### 3: Permanency Constellation

When children enter out-of-home care, the central goal of the child welfare or probation agency is to provide children with safe, permanent and stable homes. The constellations of permanency outcomes illustrate the types of exits and lengths of time children spend in foster care prior to their exit for the following reasons:

- Reunification
- Adoption
- Guardianship

When a child has been removed from his or her family, the most desirable goal is to return that child home as soon as it is safe. When that is not possible, the goal is most often to achieve a permanent family through adoption or guardianship.

#### 3.1 - Realignment of Adoption Services

In response to the 2011 realignment of CWS, twelve of the twenty-eight counties that previously contracted with CDSS for adoption services opted to transition their program from the state to the local level. This programmatic transition occurred over a period of 18 months, with the last of these twelve counties assuming full responsibility for their program effective July 1, 2013. With implementation of the Continuum of Care Reform and the Resource Family Approval program<sup>11</sup>, one more county is transitioning their adoption program from the state to the local level, but another county has decided to transition its adoption program from the local level to the state, effective July 1, 2017. As indicated by the permanency data presented in the figures below, the number of foster youth exiting from care to adoption remains relatively stable. Although it is too early to draw conclusions, this data may indicate that the realignment of adoption services (for those counties that opted to transition their program from the state to the local level) has not affected the number of foster youth exiting from care to adoption.

#### 3.2 - Permanency in 12 months for children entering foster care (P1)

This measure describes if, and how, children achieved permanency within 12 months of entering foster care. Specifically, it examines a cohort of children who entered foster care during a 12-month period, follows them prospectively for one year and identifies the proportion who achieved permanency through reunification, adoption or guardianship.

<sup>11</sup> Continuum of Care Reform (CCR) is a comprehensive reform effort to make sure that youth in foster care have their day-to-day physical, mental, and emotional needs met; that they have the greatest chance to grow up in permanent and supportive homes; and that they have the opportunity to grow into self-sufficient, successful adults. A key component of CCR is the Resource Family Approval (RFA) program which is a new family-friendly and child-centered caregiver approval process that combines elements of the current foster parent licensing, relative approval, and approvals for adoption and guardianship and streamlines them into one process.

As shown in Figure 12, this measure has been decreasing steadily over time with 34.8 percent of children exiting foster care to permanency within 12 months of entering care in FY 2014-15. The national standard for this measure is set at 40.5 percent or above.

In addition to a statewide decline in this measure since FY 2009-10, there are county-specific trends, and several medium to large counties have experienced a more rapid decline than the statewide decline. As the data in this measure show, the vast majority of youth exiting to permanency for this cohort are exiting to reunification at 32.2 percent, followed by guardianship at 1.6 percent and adoption at 0.9 percent. Additionally, there are trends in this measure associated with specific age groups. Children aged 13 to 17 and infants under the age of one have been exiting foster care at lower rates when compared to other age groups.

**Figure 12: Permanency within 12 months for children entering foster care**

		Jul 2009- Jun 2010	Jul 2010- Jun 2011	Jul 2011- Jun 2012	Jul 2012- Jun 2013	Jul 2013- Jun 2014	Jul 2014- Jun 2015
<b>Exited to permanency within 12 months</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>40.6%</b>	<b>39.3%</b>	<b>37.3%</b>	<b>35.6%</b>	<b>35.4%</b>	<b>34.8%</b>
	<b>n</b>	12,419	12,044	11,118	11,074	11,280	10,707
<b>Entries during 12-month period</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>30,569</b>	<b>30,626</b>	<b>29,794</b>	<b>31,138</b>	<b>31,903</b>	<b>30,800</b>
<b>Reunification</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>38.5%</b>	<b>37.0%</b>	<b>34.6%</b>	<b>32.9%</b>	<b>32.6%</b>	<b>32.2%</b>
	<b>n</b>	11,755	11,338	10,297	10,240	10,413	9,921
<b>Adoption</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>
	<b>n</b>	313	286	309	307	313	286
<b>Guardianship</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
	<b>n</b>	351	420	512	527	554	500

Agency: All, Episode Count: All Entry, Number of Days in Care: 8 days or more, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/P1.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/P1.aspx)

### 3.3 - Permanency in 12 months for children in foster care for 12 to 23 months (P2)

This measure describes the percentage of children who achieved permanency within a 12-month period and had been in foster care between 12 and 23 months on the first day of that period. Figure 13 demonstrates that exits from care to permanency for this group have remained relatively stable, ranging from 44 to 46 percent over the past six years. California surpasses the national standard for this measure, which is set at 43.6 percent. The data in this measure also show that the number of youth exiting care due to reunification is steadily declining over time. However, the number of youth in this cohort exiting foster care due to adoption or guardianship is increasing over time.



**Figure 13: Permanency within 12 months for children in foster care for 12-23 months**

Date		Jul 2010- Jun 2011	Jul 2011- Jun 2012	Jul 2012- Jun 2013	Jul 2013- Jun 2014	Jul 2014- Jun 2015	Jul 2015- Jun 2016
<b>Exited to permanency within 12 months</b>	%	<b>44.5%</b>	<b>45.5%</b>	<b>46.1%</b>	<b>45.4%</b>	<b>45.0%</b>	<b>45.1%</b>
	n	5,228	5,278	5,485	5,602	5,920	6,020
<b>In care 12 to 23 months</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>11,751</b>	<b>11,612</b>	<b>11,905</b>	<b>12,336</b>	<b>13,142</b>	<b>13,354</b>
<b>Reunification</b>	%	20.6%	19.7%	18.8%	18.8%	18.0%	17.2%
	n	2,422	2,282	2,236	2,319	2,366	2,301
<b>Adoption</b>	%	16.8%	17.9%	17.6%	18.3%	18.2%	18.1%
	n	1,970	2,076	2,094	2,260	2,394	2,411
<b>Guardianship</b>	%	7.1%	7.9%	9.7%	8.3%	8.8%	9.8%
	n	836	920	1,155	1,023	1,160	1,308

Agency: All, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/P2.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/P2.aspx)

### 3.4 - Permanency within 12 months for children in care for 24 months or more (P3)

This measure identifies children who were in foster care for 24 months or longer on the first day of a given 12-month period, in order to determine how many exited foster care to permanency before the end of that 12-month period. This measure is used to evaluate performance in achieving permanency for children who are in foster care for longer periods of time.

As evidenced by Figure 14, exits from foster care to permanency for this cohort reached a high of 28.7 percent in FY 2015-16 after fluctuating above and below 24 percent from FY 2010- 11 to FY 2013-14. Despite this increase, California still falls short of the national standard of 30.3 percent or higher. For this measure, the number of youth exiting care due to reunification shows a decline over time, while the number of youth exiting care due to adoption increased from 14.4 percent in FY 2010-11 to 19.2 percent in FY 2015-16 and guardianships increased from 4.4 percent to 5.6 percent over the same time period.

**Figure 14: Permanency within 12 months for children in foster 24 months or longer**

		Jul 2010- Jun 2011	Jul 2011- Jun 2012	Jul 2012- Jun 2013	Jul 2013- Jun 2014	Jul 2014- Jun 2015	Jul 2015- Jun 2016
<b>Exited to permanency within 12 months</b>	%	<b>23.5%</b>	<b>25.2%</b>	<b>25.1%</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>28.0%</b>	<b>28.7%</b>
	n	4,509	4,336	3,872	3,581	4,055	4,251
<b>In care 24 months or more</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>19,226</b>	<b>17,194</b>	<b>15,398</b>	<b>14,501</b>	<b>14,487</b>	<b>14,790</b>
<b>Reunification</b>	%	4.7%	4.4%	4.2%	3.8%	3.9%	4.0%
	n	902	750	646	558	567	585
<b>Adoption</b>	%	14.4%	16.5%	16.0%	16.1%	19.1%	19.2%
	n	2,766	2,835	2,461	2,335	2,768	2,833
<b>Guardianship</b>	%	4.4%	4.4%	5.0%	4.7%	5.0%	5.6%
	n	841	751	765	688	720	833

Agency: All, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/P3.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/P3.aspx)

When these cohorts exit foster care to permanent living situations, they exit to different types of permanency at different rates depending on how long they have been in care. For instance, children who exit to permanency within 12 months of entering care do so through reunification about 93 percent of the time and through adoption just under 3 percent of the time. Children who were in care between 12 and 23 months exited to reunification and adoption at nearly equal rates. Finally, just 14 percent of children who found permanency after being in care for 24 months or longer exited through reunification while 67 percent exited through adoption. This trend clearly demonstrates that the longer a child stays in foster care, the more likely he or she will find a permanent family through adoption as opposed to reunification. This trend may be attributed to federal and state time limits for providing families with reunification services. In California, reunification services are typically provided for 18 months. After that time, reunification services are terminated and county CWS agencies proceed with securing other permanency options for these children through guardianship or adoption.

### 3.5 - Reentry within 12 months for entries discharged to reunification or guardianship (P4)

The reentry measure describes the percentage of children (0-17 years old) reentering foster care within a year of returning to their families or being placed in the care of a legal guardian. Also, this measure includes exits from care to guardianship and reunification, rather than reunification only. For children who experience multiple re-entries into foster care, only the first reentry is counted.

Foster care reentry rates following reunification or guardianship provide helpful information in determining whether or not child welfare policies and practices are effective in successfully transitioning children back into their families of origin or with another legal guardian and whether the services being provided to these children and families during reunification are effective. As seen in Figure 15, although reentry peaked at 12.5 percent in 2011-12, it is now

down to 11.8 percent for 2013-14. The national standard is 8.3 percent or less children reentering care within 12 months following reunification or guardianship.

Upon further examination of child welfare data (not reflected in this report), higher rates of reentry are clustered in two age groups: children under the age of two and children between the ages of 13 and 16. Additionally, Asian American and Pacific Islander children reenter care at much lower rates than other racial/ethnic groups.

**Figure 15: Reentry within 12 months for entries discharged to reunification or guardianship**

Date		Jul 2008- Jun 2009	Jul 2009- Jun 2010	Jul 2010- Jun 2011	Jul 2011- Jun 2012	Jul 2012- Jun 2013	Jul 2013- Jun 2014
Children with reentries	%	12.4%	11.9%	12.0%	12.5%	12.1%	11.8%
	n	1,517	1,422	1,394	1,333	1,281	1,275
Children with entries, exit to reunification or guardianship	N	12,218	11,936	11,595	10,647	10,615	10,819

Agency: All, Episode Count: All Entry, Number of Days in Care: 8 days or more, Age: 0-17 Years

Data Source: CWS/CMS 2016 Quarter 3 Extract.

[http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/P4.aspx](http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/P4.aspx)

### 3.6 - Status at Exit for Youth Aging Out of Foster Care

This set of data tracks the status of foster youth when they exit foster care at age 18 or older while still under the jurisdiction of the court. Foster youth who have legally emancipated from foster care before the age of 18 are also included in this measure. The data in Figure 16 reflect changes in youth exiting care with the implementation of the After 18 Program (AB 12), the extension of foster care benefits beyond age 18 up to the age of 21. This means fewer youth are exiting foster care at age 18; therefore, there are fewer youth included in the current data. The information gathered on this population is reported in percentages and is grouped into the following four categories:

**Educational Achievement** is a measure of the percentage of foster youth who exit with a high school diploma or its equivalent. This does not include youth who have passed proficiency exams or obtained certificates.

**Employment** is a measure of the percentage of foster youth who are employed on a full-time or part-time basis upon leaving foster care. Employment is important as work experience will help youth build résumés for future employment. However, it is not expected that all youth would need full-time employment to support themselves, as some may enter college or vocational school.

**Housing arrangements** is a measure of the percentage of foster youth who have any type of housing plan for leaving care, including plans such as living rent-free with friends, living with a biological parent, or arrangements for subsidized or transitional housing.

**Permanency connection** is a measure of the percentage of foster youth who report having at least one adult they can go to for advice, support, and guidance.

As shown in Figure 16, the majority of foster youth exit care having completed high school or its equivalent, with housing arrangements and a permanency connection. The implementation of the After 18 Program in 2012, whereby a greater number of foster youth may elect to pursue college or vocational school in lieu of employment as a requirement to participate in the program, may be a factor contributing to the low number of foster youth having obtained employment at the time of their exit from care.

**Figure 16: Status at exit of youth aging out of foster care**

		Jul-Sep 2015	Oct-Dec 2015	Jan-Mar 2016	Apr-Jun 2016	Jul-Sep 2016
<b>Completed high school or equivalency</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>69%</b>
	<b>n</b>	595	683	550	521	556
<b>Youth with housing arrangements</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>85%</b>
	<b>n</b>	770	843	734	683	686
<b>Obtained employment</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>47%</b>
	<b>n</b>	402	469	353	384	379
<b>Youth with permanency connection</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>91%</b>
	<b>n</b>	792	908	773	729	738
<b>Whereabouts known during time period</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>1,068</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>846</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>807</b>

Agency: All

Data Sources:

Child Welfare: The Outcomes for Nonminor Dependents Child Welfare Youth Exiting Foster Care Quarterly Statistical Report SOC 405X

Probation: The Outcomes for Nonminor Dependents Probation Foster Youth Exiting Foster Care Quarterly Statistical Report SOC 405XP

[http://csr.berkeley.edu/ucb\\_childwelfare/CDSSFiles.aspx?report=8A](http://csr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/CDSSFiles.aspx?report=8A)

## COUNTY REALIGNMENT GROWTH FUNDS & CWS STAFFING

SB 855 (Committee of Budget and Fiscal Review, Chapter 29, Statutes of 2014) amended W&IC Section 10104 to require this annual Realignment report to include the amount of Realignment growth funds each county receives, the CWS social worker caseloads for each county, and the number of authorized positions in each county CWS agency. This information is displayed below in two sections: 1) county Realignment growth funds; and 2) CWS county staffing.

## 1: County Realignment Growth Funds

In addition to the Protective Services Subaccount base funding each county receives, pursuant to Government Code (GC) Section 30027.6, the SCO distributes Realignment growth funds to each county annually.

Pursuant to GC Section 30027.5 and 30027.9, funding from the 2011 LRF is allocated as follows:

- To the Support Services Account; 63 percent is then allocated to the Protective Services Subaccount.
- To the Sales and Use Tax Growth Account; 65 percent is then allocated to the Support Services Growth Subaccount.

The following allocations are made from the Support Services Growth Subaccount to the Protective Services Growth Special Account:

- 40 percent is designated for CWS until the Department of Finance (DOF) certifies that a total of \$200 million has been allocated
- 21.81 percent is for general growth

Realignment growth funds are calculated by DOF and a schedule that allocates funding to the subaccount is submitted to SCO.

GC Section 30025 provides that the money in the Protective Services Subaccount and the Protective Services Growth Special Account may be used for CWS costs as described in statute, regulation and the Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project. This includes the use of these funds to hire additional CWS staff or provide additional funds to support various CWS programs.

Below, in Figure 17, is the county-by-county break-out of total Protective Services Growth Special Account funding (growth funds) allocated from SCO for FY 2014-15<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> Each county's FY 2014-15 Protective Services Subaccount growth was distributed by the SCO on December 24, 2015, and provided to counties via County Fiscal Letter (CFL) 15/16-45.

**Figure 17: Total FY 2014-15 Growth Fund Allocations**

<b>County</b>	<b>Total FY 2014-15 Growth Fund Allocations</b>
Alameda	\$5,853,797.69
Alpine	\$68,219.09
Amador	\$113,502.33
Butte	\$1,168,416.83
Calaveras	\$187,832.20
Colusa	\$108,627.10
Contra Costa	\$3,303,676.69
Del Norte	\$289,522.01
El Dorado	\$542,340.71
Fresno	\$3,242,773.24
Glenn	\$222,631.26
Humboldt	\$793,113.02
Imperial	\$694,272.29
Inyo	\$116,569.69
Kern	\$3,887,489.60
Kings	\$546,272.81
Lake	\$305,090.66
Lassen	\$225,994.43
Los Angeles	\$44,762,218.13
Madera	\$483,680.98
Marin	\$437,364.29
Mariposa	\$136,752.42
Mendocino	\$732,671.62
Merced	\$1,007,469.19

Modoc	\$79,914.45
Mono	\$82,877.29
Monterey	\$1,087,866.39
Napa	\$400,850.88
Nevada	\$227,073.47
Orange	\$7,245,227.49
Placer	\$1,222,351.08
Plumas	\$144,637.56
Riverside	\$7,861,089.01
Sacramento	\$7,071,612.89
San Benito	\$170,450.98
San Bernardino	\$6,981,344.38
San Diego	\$10,314,749.64
San Francisco	\$2,961,370.70
San Joaquin	\$2,601,639.42
San Luis Obispo	\$1,147,894.61
San Mateo	\$1,501,013.58
Santa Barbara	\$1,023,341.55
Santa Clara	\$5,599,238.33
Santa Cruz	\$759,926.72
Shasta	\$850,821.68
Sierra	\$67,960.53
Siskiyou	\$237,471.66
Solano	\$912,733.53
Sonoma	\$1,518,674.71
Stanislaus	\$1,606,017.62
Sutter	\$431,093.31



Tehama	\$415,331.54
Trinity	\$181,450.44
Tulare	\$1,692,043.44
Tuolumne	\$229,403.95
Ventura	\$1,530,081.08
Yolo	\$608,614.56
Yuba	\$520,466.25

Information from counties related to Realignment growth funds indicates that overall county spending for FedGAP Assistance, APS and the After 18 program is steadily increasing and that counties are using their SCO growth fund allocations to cover this increase. In addition, counties indicate they have used their growth fund allocations to hire additional CWS and APS staff.

## 2: CWS County Staffing

SB 855 requires CDSS to provide county caseload and staffing information. Figure 18 below provides county caseload and staffing information for all 58 counties. The number of cases is based on point-in-time data from October 1, 2016 and includes all open CWS cases (both in-home and foster care). The total number of investigations includes all referrals in which allegations met the investigation threshold per California's ER Protocol for FY 2016. The information on the average total number of positions is based on data for Quarter 3 and 4 of FY 2014-15 and Quarter 1 and 2 for FY 2015-16 as identified by the County Welfare Directors Association of California (CWDA). For CWS social workers, this information includes social workers with an active caseload in hotline, ER (immediate and 10 day), family maintenance (voluntary and court-ordered), permanency planning, adoptions and extended foster care (After 18 programs). For administrative workers, this information includes specialized positions, such as educational liaisons, child and family team facilitators, court writers, licensing and relative home approval staff, quality assurance staff, etc.

**Figure 18: CWS County Staffing**

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Cases*</b>	<b>Number of Investigations **</b>	<b>Average Number of Full Time Equivalent Positions ***</b>	<b>Average Number of Case Carrying Social Workers ***</b>	<b>Average Number of Clerical Workers ***</b>	<b>Average Number of Administrative Workers***</b>
<b>Alameda</b>	2,049	6,341	344	235	107	2
<b>Alpine</b>	1	20	1.6	0.8	0.2	0.6
<b>Amador</b>	113	265	11	9	2	1
<b>Butte</b>	741	1,363	104	73	7	23
<b>Calaveras</b>	142	425	10	10	0	0
<b>Colusa</b>	37	202	6	4	1	1
<b>Contra Costa</b>	1,456	4,862	218	145	55	17
<b>Del Norte</b>	123	506	23	14	7	3
<b>El Dorado</b>	389	1,353	50	33	14	3
<b>Fresno</b>	2,676	14,202	351	244	84	24
<b>Glenn</b>	112	353	16	12	3	1
<b>Humboldt</b>	567	1,020	110	52	32	22
<b>Imperial</b>	538	1,234	96	67	16	13
<b>Inyo</b>	40	28	6	5	0	1
<b>Kern</b>	2,348	12,356	391	264	29	98
<b>Kings</b>	543	1,748	60	44	10	6
<b>Lake</b>	177	512	34	21	5	8
<b>Lassen</b>	89	288	18	11	2	5
<b>Los Angeles</b>	36,031	110,238	5,998	3,794	956	1,248
<b>Madera</b>	501	1,758	49	34	11	4
<b>Marin</b>	123	586	36	26	4	6
<b>Mariposa</b>	49	205	7	5	2	0

<b>Mendocino</b>	415	1,172	108	44	44	20
<b>Merced</b>	775	3,951	89	49	2	38
<b>Modoc</b>	18	222	7	4	2	1
<b>Mono</b>	29	90	4	4	0	0
<b>Monterey</b>	505	2,278	79	47	15	17
<b>Napa</b>	153	829	36	25	9	2
<b>Nevada</b>	78	517	13	9	3	1
<b>Orange</b>	3,372	19,573	718	461	193	63
<b>Placer</b>	431	1,797	71	56	12	3
<b>Plumas</b>	82	162	8	8	0	0
<b>Riverside</b>	5,536	32,963	978	611	158	209
<b>Sacramento</b>	3,852	12,913	584	413	121	50
<b>San Benito</b>	75	289	17	13	4	1
<b>San Bernardino</b>	7,257	27,013	677	404	194	79
<b>San Diego</b>	4,093	34,271	952	682	10	166
<b>San Francisco</b>	1,285	3,064	304	197	11	96
<b>San Joaquin</b>	1,838	5,112	167	115	26	25
<b>San Luis Obispo</b>	487	2,705	107	53	33	22
<b>San Mateo</b>	598	2,839	150	101	19	30
<b>Santa Barbara</b>	545	3,713	105	64	24	17
<b>Santa Clara</b>	2,039	10,761	515	325	76	114
<b>Santa Cruz</b>	413	2,066	82	53	11	18
<b>Shasta</b>	586	1,913	100	61	22	17
<b>Sierra</b>	7	14	2	2	0	0
<b>Siskiyou</b>	149	674	18	14	0	4
<b>Solano</b>	597	3,393	80	62	15	3
<b>Sonoma</b>	837	2,665	133	93	31	9
<b>Stanislaus</b>	1,171	4,803	132	91	28	14

<b>Sutter</b>	192	525	28	21	4	3
<b>Tehama</b>	300	723	32	21	7	5
<b>Trinity</b>	72	122	9	9	0	0
<b>Tulare</b>	1,387	8,380	170	111	26	33
<b>Tuolumne</b>	131	400	22	16	3	3
<b>Ventura</b>	1,181	8,406	256	136	68	52
<b>Yolo</b>	441	1,260	49	34	9	6
<b>Yuba</b>	288	559	36	22	9	4

\* Caseload based on point-in-time data of October 1, 2016.

\*\*Investigations based on data from FFY 2016.

\*\*\*County staffing information are based off of annual averages of staff as identified by counties for Q3, Q4 of FY 2014-15 and Q1, Q2 of FY 2015-16). The average number of full-time equivalent position does not include supervisor/management positions in the county.

With the passage of AB 2015 (Chapter 182, Statutes of 2016), this report now includes information about how close counties participating in the Title IV-E Well Being Project are to funding the optimum caseload ratios recommended by the evaluation conducted pursuant to Section 10609.5, also known as the California SB 2030 Study. Figure 19 below, shows the minimum caseload and optimum caseload standards as recommended by the SB 2030 study for the four main service components of child welfare: Emergency Repose (ER), Family Maintenance (FM), Family Reunification (FR) and Permanency Planning (PP). The chart also reflects the current caseload ratios in each of the service components for the nine counties participating in the Title IV-E Well Being Project using data extracted from CWS/CMS and filtered using Safe Measures for any open case and assigned caseworker in January 2017.

Figure 19: Caseload Ratios for Counties Participating in the Title IV-E Well Being Project

	ER	FM	FR	PP
<b>SB 2030 Minimum Standards<sup>1</sup></b>	13.03	14.17	15.58	23.67
<b>SB 2030 Optimum Standards<sup>1</sup></b>	9.88	10.15	11.94	16.42
<b><u>Cases per Social Worker</u></b>				
<b>Alameda</b>	22.20	16.90	14.74	18.28
<b>Butte</b>	26.86	16.94	15.06	21.53
<b>Los Angeles</b>	9.61	19.96	20.24	19.70
<b>Lake</b>	35.31	8.73	14.74	15.86
<b>Sacramento</b>	14.80	17.77	15.32	30.66
<b>Santa Clara</b>	8.09	16.77	9.22	14.31
<b>San Diego</b>	15.80	16.24	12.94	14.21
<b>San Francisco</b>	6.81	13.58	12.72	15.11
<b>Sonoma</b>	12.15	15.40	15.49	16.36

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/cdssweb/res/cws/sb2030final/pdf/section5.pdf>

County data was extracted in January 2017 using Safe Measures and reflects any open case and assigned caseworker at that time.

As a result of the implementation of the Extended Foster Care program, a new service category of Supportive Transitions (ST) was created. Since that service component was not established when the SB 2030 study was published, those cases in ST have been redistributed to the PP service component.

Gold reflects cases per service component that are below the SB 2030 Optimum Caseload Standards.

Brown reflects cases per service component that are below SB 2030 Minimum Caseload Standards.

## Realignment Expenditures Summary

The Realignment Expenditures Summary (Attachment A) includes the statewide LRF and county fiscal expenditures by assistance payments, federally required services, optional state services, adult protective services, county case management and Title IV-E Waiver. The programs that fall into these categories are provided below. County-level expenditures by program are also included in Attachment A.

**Assistance** - This category reflects expenditures for payments to foster care providers, including:

- Adoptions Assistance Program (AAP)
- After 18 (inclusive of SILPs and THP + FC)
- Federal Guardian Assistance Program (Fed-GAP) Assistance
- Foster Care Assistance

**Federally Required Services** - This category reflects expenditures for federally required child welfare services, including:

- Adoptions
- County Third Party Contracts
- Child Welfare Services - Services
- Extended Independent Living Program (ILP)
- Foster Care Administration
- Foster Parent Training & Recruitment (FPT&R)<sup>13</sup>
- Group Home Monthly Visits (GHMV)
- Kinship Foster Care Emergency Fund

**Optional State Services** - This category reflects expenditures for optional state programs in which counties have discretion as to whether or not they provide these services, including:

- CWS Outcome Improvement Project (CWSOIP)
- Emancipated Foster Youth Stipends (EYS)
- Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP)
- LRF Family Preservation Permanent Transfer (SFP)
- Substance Abuse/Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infant (SA/HIV Infant)
- Supportive Therapeutic Options Program (STOP)
- Transitional Housing for Foster Youth (THPP)
- Transitional Housing for Former Foster Youth – Plus (THPP-Plus)

**Adult Protective Services** - See information in “Adult Protective Services” section on page 38.

**County Case Management** - This category reflects expenditures for administrative costs for case management activities provided by county staff.

- Child Welfare Services Basic

**Title IV-E Well-Being Project** - This category reflects the expenditures for the nine counties participating the California Title IV-E Well-Being Project (formerly referred to as the Title IV-E

<sup>13</sup> The expenditures reflected for this program are part of the Foster Care Initiative, AB 2129 (Chapter 1089, Statutes of 1993), which provides specialized training for foster parents of children with special care needs, and specific recruitment activities for minority and sibling placements. This program was implemented on January 1, 1994. This program and funding was realigned and is separate from the Foster Parent Retention and Recruitment Support (FPPRS) program authorized by the Budget Act of 2015.

Waiver project), which provides California with the flexibility to invest existing resources more effectively in proven and innovative approaches that better ensure the safety of children and the success of families. This flexibility gives counties the opportunity to reinvest resources into more cost-efficient approaches that achieve better outcomes. The target population includes children and youth aged 0–17, inclusive, who currently are in out-of-home placement or are at risk of entering or re-entering foster care. California’s Title IV-E Well-Being Project began on July 1, 2007 with Alameda and Los Angeles counties, and continued under three short-term bridge extensions until September 30, 2014. On September 29, 2014, the federal government approved a five-year extension and expansion of the Title IV-E Well-Being Project, for seven additional counties (Butte, Lake, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Sonoma), through September 30, 2019. The evaluation report for the Title IV-E Well-Being Project can be found at <http://www.cdss.ca.gov/inforesources/Foster-Care/Title-IV-E-Waiver-California-Well-Being-Project>. For this year’s report, the fiscal expenditures for all nine counties participating in the Title IV-E Well-Being Project are grouped together and include expenditures related to Foster Care Assistance, FPT&R, GHMV, Kinship FC Emergency Fund, CWSOIP and County Case Management.

### **FY 2015-2016 Expenditure Summary**

In FY 2015-16, LRF statewide distributions were \$2.1 billion, an increase of \$138 million over the FY 2014-15 distributions of \$1.97 billion<sup>14</sup>. The FY 2011-12 total budgeted base<sup>15</sup> was approximately \$1.62 billion.

Expenditures for FY 2014-15 include supplemental adjustment claims submitted by counties and are now final. Since FY 2014-15 expenditures have been updated and finalized, the totals may differ from those presented in last year’s Realignment report. FY 2015-16 expenditures reflect those reported as of December 2016 and are not yet final, as counties may submit revisions for up to nine months after the end of each quarter. For this reason, comparing FY 2015-16 expenditures with previous years’ expenditures may not provide an accurate depiction of county spending since the FY 2015-16 expenditures are not final. For example, in FY 2012-13, one large county reported expenditures of just one percent of funding for STOP as of November 2013. By the end of the nine-month period after the end of FY 2012-13, however, the county had submitted supplemental claims for all of the remaining funds for STOP.

Based on a comparison of LRF and county expenditures in FY 2011-12 (the first FY after Realignment went into effect) and FY 2015-16, there has been a consistent increase in net total spending, with FY 2011-12 net expenditures totaling \$2.9 billion and FY 2015-16 expenditures totaling \$3.45 billion, an increase of \$544 million. Since FY 2011-12, there has been steady growth in spending in the Assistance and Title IV-E Well-Being Project expenditure categories,

<sup>14</sup> The Protective Services Subaccount Base distributed by the SCO for FY 2014-15 and revised base for FY 2015-16 as provided in County Fiscal Letter (CFL) 15/16-45.

<sup>15</sup> Budgeted base refers to the total amount of State General Fund that was realigned to counties with the passage of the Budget Act of 2011.



with steady decreases in spending in the Optional State Services category. However, spending in this category is up slightly, approximately 9 percent from the prior FY. As noted above, there may be future adjustments in FY 2015-16 expenditures that increase final spending to the same or even higher levels than FY 2014-15.

As reported in last year's Realignment report, some programs that experienced a decline in expenditures in FY 2012-13 experienced an increase in expenditures in FY 2013-14 and continue to increase in FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16. Programs that have continued to increase spending since FY 2013-14 are:

- **Fed-GAP Assistance** – Since FY 2012-13, statewide spending has increased by \$17 million, or 77 percent. Forty-nine counties increased their Fed-GAP spending in FY 2015-16. The most notable increase was in a large county, which increased its spending by \$3 million in FY 2013-14, \$2.6 million more in FY 2014-15, and an additional \$3 million in FY 2015-16. Two small counties began claiming Fed-GAP expenditures for the first time in FY 2015-16, while 7 counties did not claim any Fed-GAP expenditures. The overall increase in statewide Fed-GAP spending may be attributed to an increase in eligible Fed-GAP cases.
- **ILP Extended** – Since FY 12-13 statewide spending has increased by \$4.4 million, or 33 percent. Twenty-six counties increased their ILP spending in FY 2015-16 while twenty-eight counties have decreased their spending. The most notable increase was in a large county, which increased its spending by almost \$1 million, or 16 percent. Two small counties began claiming ILP expenditures for the first time in FY 2015-16. The overall increase in statewide ILP spending may be attributed to outreach efforts by CDSS to the counties on data entry and clarification about eligible ILP services. In addition, CDSS issued policy clarifications to notify counties they are required to engage eligible nonminor dependent (NMD) youth in ILP services within certain timeframes. Although ILP eligibility has always been up to the age of 21, NMD youth who stay in extended foster care are more likely to access ILP services than those who leave care.

In addition to the increase in expenditures for the programs listed above, counties have steadily increased expenditures for some programs across all five FYs and continue to increase their expenditures in FY 2015-16. These programs are AAP, After 18, Adoptions and KSSP.

As with prior year Realignment reports, counties continue to spend less on the optional program, STOP. Since Realignment went into effect in FY 2011-12, there has been a total decrease in statewide spending for the STOP program of \$2.3 million, or 19 percent. Five large-size counties decreased STOP spending in FY 2015-16. The most notable decrease was a large county, which decreased spending between FY 2014-15 to FY 2015-16 from \$503,686 to \$304,617, a decrease of 40 percent. Twenty counties did not claim any STOP expenditures for FY 2015-16. Information from counties suggests that these decreases are not the result of programmatic changes or utilization decreases. Rather, staffing turnover has resulted in some claiming issues as well as delayed claims submission from some counties. It is likely that STOP expenditures will increase for FY 2015-16 when expenditures are finalized. For example, in

comparing STOP expenditures for FY 2013-14 provided in last year's Realignment report with the finalized FY 2013-14 expenditures, total STOP spending was roughly 6 percent higher than initially reported.

Previous Realignment reports noted consistent statewide decreases in both THPP expenditures and THP-Plus expenditures. However, expenditures for FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16 have increased for THPP. Information from counties suggests this increase in expenditures is due to an increase in the number of available beds for the program. THP-Plus has experienced decreases in expenditures since Realignment went into effect in FY 2011-12, however, for FY 2015-16, there has been an increase in spending from the prior year of \$2.2 million, or nine percent. As previously reported, the decrease in THP-Plus spending is believed to be caused in part by the implementation of the After 18 Program, which allows NMD youth to remain in care up to the age of 21. However, statute changes have allowed for the use of THP-Plus as a housing option for youth who exit care after the age of 21. As the first cohort of youth who opted to stay in care under the After 18 program have turned 21 and exited the system in FY 15-16, it is believed that counties are utilizing the THP-Plus program to provide housing for these youth.

## ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES

The APS program investigated over 176,000<sup>16</sup> reports of elder and dependent adult abuse per year in California, at an annual total cost of about \$152 million. The program's mandate is to investigate and provide remediation to any elderly and disabled person living in the community who is alleged to be experiencing abuse, neglect or exploitation. Cases range from simple situations such as providing food for a person who has lost their wallet to extremely complex situations of financial abuse involving property transfers and money laundering through multiple accounts.

In 2011, funding for the California APS program was realigned to the counties. This report tracks changes in the program since FY 2011-12, focusing on changes that have taken place since Realignment.

APS plays a pivotal role in the state's mandatory reporting system as the first responder to most reports from professionals and the public. It works closely with law enforcement, long term care ombudsmen, long term services and supports (LTSS), physicians and others. APS workers play a key role in forensics centers, financial abuse specialist teams (FASTs) and multidisciplinary teams. The federal government has acknowledged the primacy of APS in the broader elder justice network through the creation of the Office of Elder Justice and Adult Protective Services within the Administration for Community Living (ACL), the release of national standards for APS and the creation of a national database, the National Adult Maltreatment Reporting System (NAMRS).

<sup>16</sup> All figures of reports received, active cases, findings of abuse are derived from the monthly SOC 242 reports from the counties.

### Population Demographics

In FY 2015-16, California received over 176,000 reports of alleged elder and dependent adult abuse. This represents a 10 percent increase from the previous year, and a 27 percent rise from FY 2011-12. This upsurge clearly correlates to the growth in California's senior population. The chart below shows that the elder population has increased by one million individuals – an additional 2 percent of the population-since the program was realigned in 2011.

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
<b>CA Population Aged 65+</b>	<b>4,398,624</b> <b>(11.7% of CA)</b>	<b>4,600,085</b> <b>(12.1% of CA)</b>	<b>4,797,000</b> <b>(12.5% of CA)</b>	<b>4,986,000</b> <b>(12.9% of CA)</b>	<b>5,189,000</b> <b>(13.3% of CA)</b>	<b>5,383,187</b> <b>(13.7% of CA)</b>

CA Dept. of Aging

California's elder population is growing twice as fast as the total population with more than half of all California counties having growth rates of more than 150 percent.<sup>17</sup> The number of dependent adults is also expected to increase by as much as 20 percent in the next 20 years. The changes in the population served by APS must be considered both when evaluating changes since Realignment and planning for the future of the APS program. Also, four times as many elders and dependent adults live in the community rather than reside in facilities. APS is the only social service agency with any oversight of the care they receive in their own homes – it provides the safety net for the home and community based programs that are quickly replacing institutionalized care.

APS initiates investigations on abuse allegations within a prescribed time period after receiving the complaint and keeps records of the time it takes to close a case. The majority of cases (50 percent) are closed within 30 days. CDSS and counties are exploring better metrics to measure the amount of work involved in APS cases, through a \$200,000 federal NAMRS grant that runs through 2018, discussed later.

---

<sup>17</sup> California Department of Aging

### Abuse Reports

As would be expected given the population growth, APS reports are increasing. The number of reports received has grown 27.7 percent since 2011.

#### **APS Reports Received Statewide**

<b>Type of Report</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Percent of Change</b>
Elder Abuse Reports	86,614	122,122	+29% increase
Dependent Adult Reports	41,150	50,519	+17% increase
Unknown at time of Report	Data Not Available	3,527	
<b>Total Number of Reports</b>	<b>128,124</b>	<b>176,168</b>	<b>+27.7% increase</b>

### Types of Abuse

The charts below reflect investigations of alleged abuse by category. Self-neglect continues to be the most commonly reported type of abuse. Investigations for this type have increased by nearly 300 percent since Realignment.

#### **FY 2011-12 vs. FY 2015-16 Number of Self-Neglect Investigations<sup>18</sup>**

<b>Abuse Through Self-Neglect</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Percentage Change</b>
Physical	16,917	23,122	6,205	27%
Medical	13,331	23,469	10,138	43%
Health/Safety	18,405	39,130	20,725	53%
Malnutrition/Dehydration	3,525	6,820	3,295	48%
Financial	5,582	9,503	3,921	41%
<b>Total</b>	<b>57,760</b>	<b>102,044</b>	<b>6,205</b>	<b>27%</b>

#### **FY 2011-12 vs. FY 2015-16 Number of Abuse by Others Investigations**

<b>Abuse by Others</b>	<b>FY 2011-12</b>	<b>FY 2015-16</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Percentage Change</b>
Physical	10,779	20,289	9,510	47%
Sexual	1,082	2,002	920	46%
Financial	22,713	38,790	16,077	41%
Neglect	15,933	29,471	13,538	46%
Abandonment	689	2,187	1,498	68%
Isolation	1,958	5,039	3,081	61%
Abduction	118	810	692	85%
Psychological/Mental	16,984	29,783	12,799	43%
<b>Total</b>	<b>70,256</b>	<b>128,371</b>	<b>581,150</b>	<b>45%</b>

<sup>18</sup> Reports can lead to multiple investigations as they may allege more than one type of abuse

The following table shows county APS expenditures since Realignment and the percentages and direction of change.

**APS Expenditures by County**

County	FY 2011-12	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	Percent change since 2011-12
Alameda	\$6,286,835	\$7,181,284	\$8,901,791	\$11,306,376	79.80%
Alpine	\$95,674	\$80,827	\$83,756	\$78,462	-1.80%
Amador	\$49,826	\$105,301	\$89,215	\$152,312	205.00%
Butte	\$762,766	\$716,444	\$858,683	\$1,173,956	53.90%
Calaveras	\$161,383	\$193,159	\$230,357	\$247,956	53.60%
Colusa	\$36,925	\$140,189	\$182,819	\$95,249	157.90%
Contra Costa	\$1,931,055	\$2,650,380	\$2,991,775	\$2,914,833	50.90%
Del Norte	\$111,259	\$119,688	\$233,790	\$174,308	56.60%
El Dorado	\$224,929	\$298,440	\$256,186	\$486,009	116.00%
Fresno	\$1,926,870	\$1,925,529	\$1,842,606	\$1,890,824	-1.80%
Glenn	\$66,911	\$105,085	\$167,901	\$187,289	179.00%
Humboldt	\$821,524	\$823,553	\$989,217	\$1,269,689	54.50%
Imperial	\$400,476	\$364,833	\$571,274	\$845,766	111.00%
Inyo	\$133,331	\$138,364	\$120,216	\$129,984	-2.50%
Kern	\$1,164,687	\$1,494,678	\$1,485,281	\$1,444,926	2.40%
Kings	\$189,311	\$220,453	\$340,496	\$352,600	86.20%
Lake	\$144,871	\$317,602	\$283,149	\$320,633	121.00%
Lassen	\$108,694	\$120,301	\$114,194	\$124,817	14.80%
Los Angeles	\$31,066,160	\$29,156,041	\$28,262,350	\$28,403,145	-8.50%
Madera	\$227,160	\$275,190	\$546,523	\$569,799	150.00%
Marin	\$1,471,315	\$1,316,336	\$1,748,853	\$2,031,975	38.00%
Mariposa	\$200,902	\$156,918	\$167,238	\$169,608	-15.50%
Mendocino	\$829,978	\$846,828	\$1,014,673	\$1,389,495	67.40%
Merced	\$544,680	\$494,921	\$448,702	\$510,437	-6.20%
Modoc	\$89,323	\$83,227	\$116,240	\$122,401	37.00%
Mono	\$90,010	\$79,234	\$102,348	\$89,443	-0.60%
Monterey	\$1,601,002	\$1,644,061	\$1,548,278	\$1,575,898	-1.50%
Napa	\$439,624	\$523,871	\$578,569	\$611,912	39.10%
Nevada	\$313,457	\$292,965	\$262,398	\$362,867	15.70%
Orange	\$5,797,692	\$6,475,793	\$7,191,682	\$9,101,603	56.00%
Placer	\$1,934,522	\$1,500,075	\$1,458,137	\$1,319,503	-31.70%
Plumas	\$48,231	\$39,099	\$27,504	\$46,113	-4.30%
Riverside	\$3,603,405	\$4,549,445	\$6,309,157	\$7,822,631	117.00%
Sacramento	\$5,294,030	\$6,145,970	\$7,004,736	\$9,649,223	82.20%
San Benito	\$110,113	\$146,528	\$112,918	\$142,619	29.50%

San Bernardino	\$2,661,326	\$2,969,144	\$3,079,935	\$3,061,217	15.20%
San Diego	\$5,336,953	\$6,829,243	\$7,239,361	\$7,681,044	43.00%
San Francisco	\$19,800,011	\$19,278,278	\$21,308,683	\$23,093,668	16.60%
San Joaquin	\$913,073	\$954,494	\$1,141,608	\$815,549	-10.60%
San Luis Obispo	\$659,833	\$402,870	\$489,265	\$524,630	-20.40%
San Mateo	\$2,298,509	\$2,440,823	\$2,637,820	\$3,043,473	32.40%
Santa Barbara	\$955,429	\$1,150,327	\$1,429,838	\$1,713,472	79.30%
Santa Clara	\$9,774,744	\$10,830,493	\$11,429,857	\$12,736,984	30.30%
Santa Cruz	\$403,027	\$588,775	\$572,762	\$787,581	95.40%
Shasta	\$728,654	\$708,002	\$784,281	\$816,265	12.00%
Sierra	\$50,802	\$53,796	\$41,309	\$31,434	-38.10%
Siskiyou	\$62,153	\$148,137	\$102,711	\$146,969	136.40%
Solano	\$1,298,039	\$1,423,971	\$1,591,750	\$1,897,965	46.20%
Sonoma	\$1,729,716	\$2,620,761	\$2,998,761	\$4,265,085	146.00%
Stanislaus	\$694,469	\$812,610	\$905,616	\$1,008,222	45.10%
Sutter	\$132,032	\$116,079	\$143,950	\$184,112	39.40%
Tehama	\$274,140	\$384,320	\$334,020	\$651,741	137.70%
Trinity	\$148,977	\$214,627	\$324,836	\$293,354	96.90%
Tulare	\$500,757	\$737,484	\$750,780	\$900,917	79.90%
Tuolumne	\$142,119	\$74,062	\$120,538	\$159,735	12.30%
Ventura	\$2,361,915	\$2,366,100	\$2,753,507	\$3,254,502	37.80%
Yolo	\$361,264	\$266,061	\$554,228	\$564,306	56.20%
Yuba	\$170,359	\$176,364	\$174,448	\$193,471	12.50%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$119,737,232</b>	<b>\$126,269,433</b>	<b>\$137,552,876</b>	<b>\$152,011,257</b>	<b>26.9%</b>

From the over 176,000 reports of abuse received in FY 2015-16, nearly 230,000 investigations<sup>19</sup> were undertaken by an estimated 750 fulltime county APS social workers across the state. The allocation of their time is determined by supervisory staff, but a rough breakdown shows that, on average, each investigator closes 305 investigations per year. This translates to each worker undertaking 25 new investigations per month.

<sup>19</sup> Reports can lead to multiple investigations.

<b>Number of APS investigations</b>	<b>Number of County APS investigators</b>	<b>Average number of investigations per year</b>	<b>Average number of investigations on a monthly basis.</b>
<b>228,449</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>25</b>

#### Data Collection

California currently collects about half the data that NAMRS views as key indicators for fully understanding elder abuse. CDSS and the counties are developing a data collection apparatus consistent with national norms prescribed by the NAMRS to better track the patterns and subsequent allocation of resources in protecting this growing vulnerable segment of our population. This work is being funded through a \$200,000 federal “Grant to Enhance Adult Protective Services” from the Administration for Community Living.

The federal grant is provided to develop a mechanism to collect comprehensive aggregate level data that will capture the challenges and successes of APS. The grant also allows CDSS to explore the most efficient and effective methodology for collecting case-level data for the entire State. However, the funding is not substantial enough to fund proposed solutions for case-level data collection.

#### Training Funds

Certain functions in realigned programs were retained at the state level for economies of scale and consistency. For APS, \$176,000 was retained in ongoing training funds by CDSS. In FY 2016-17, APS received a one-time influx of \$3 million (General Fund) to augment the base funding. This funding will allow for the delivery of 10 APS Core Competency Academies around the State, as well as four new advanced trainings in an effort to standardize and professionalize service delivery. As of the date of this report, contracts are underway with each of the three existing Regional Training Academies, and with the Public Conservators, Public Guardians and Public Administrators Association. All training materials were made available to counties and trainings were also created in an online format to ensure sustainability of training once the one-time funding is exhausted.



### Conclusion

With the growth of the population served by APS, abuse reports are growing as well. Abuse reports are up 27 percent since Realignment. CDSS and the counties are laboring to improve data collection to provide a clearer picture of victims, perpetrators and the abuse they suffer, and are contracting for training to standardize and professionalize the services being provided to them.